2014 discovery deadline in this matter. [ECF No. 25.] The parties seek a continuance on the ground that they may need additional time for followup discovery after receiving interrogatory responses, which are still outstanding. (*Id.* at 1:28-2:2.) However, the parties have not provided the Court with any indication of the due date of Plaintiff's outstanding interrogatory responses. The parties also fail to inform the Court of the subject matter of the outstanding interrogatory responses, what follow-up is anticipated once responses are received and why records subpoenas cannot be sent now instead of

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

waiting until responses are received.

Once a scheduling order has been filed pursuant to Rule 16, the "schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). "Rule 16(b)'s 'good cause' standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment. The district court may modify the pretrial schedule 'if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 advisory committee's notes (1983 amendment)). Here, the parties have not given the Court the information it needs to determine diligence or assess the parties' ability to meet the Court's current June 9, 20014 deadline. Accordingly, the parties' joint motion is **DENIED** without prejudice. Any future motion for an extension must be narrowly-tailored, detailed and address the topics identified above. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: May 12, 2014 U.S. Magistrate Judge United States District Court